(1)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

'99176 5 MAR 19 2000

No. _____

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

In re: DEAN LEDVINA,

Petitioner ex parte.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Eighth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DEAN LEDVINA
2900 N. Dixieland
Apt. E8
Rogers, Arkansas 72756
(501) 986-9910

10 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

CAN THE HONORABLE Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor be sent a subpoena for case #6278-91 at distance; or any other judge for a case at distance under demand and request.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was a per curiam opinion filed on April 6, 2000. A demand and request for the records was made to the District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Fayetteville Division. The court issued an order on June 24, 1999, denying Petitioner's request to subpoena records. On June 8, 1999, the District Court issued an order granting the request to keep the matter under seal and denied the demand and request to subpoena records.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution provides in pertinent part:

> Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech. . . .

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

About 1985 Petitioner read, in a congressman's (U.S.) newsletter, about a small group of people in the higher echelons of society that had a secret communication channel that no one was ever likely to find. Around 1989

Petitioner came to know a small group of people that used that technology (that very ability or technology) for recreational purposes. That ability involves the use of inner ear and inner voice mechanisms that we all have and can be turned on by a few that know how to implement it. It allows us to communicate clearly over great distances without the aid of any electronic equipment.

When Petitioner's inner ear and inner voice was first turned on Petitioner had no forewarning. The first thing Petitioner heard was, "it worked"; that also was done at a great distance away from me. Petitioner believes he knew who did it. Petitioner was very disadvantaged. Petitioner had no formal training and no idea of how they operate on that channel. Petitioner was asked a lot of questions and answered them all as truthfully as he could. What Petitioner did not know was that all of them are liars and deceivers with their own individual purposes in mind. Some of them are very good at impersonating other people, even people that you know, and most of them use cover names to disguise their real identity.

Their interrogations are intense. They derive their information as to what questions to ask, from answers they get from the questions they do ask. Petitioner thought everyone in that community agreed on everything assuming they all desired a one world government. Petitioner got the understanding from his reading. Petitioner was wrong. It took him a long time to understand that one party asking the questions was the FBI. Petitioner believes their motives are way ahead of the private sectors motives in using this technology.

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

This case is probably one of the more bizarre cases this court has likely ever seen. It involves the beginning evolution of a new technology in the private sector and of that same technology that apparently is routinely used, on a very limited basis, in the civil service sector.

Petitioner has no other way to trace monies sued for at distance.

Is petitioner a prophet as suggested at distance by Justice O'Connor.

This case will pave the way for a new vein of law if this new technology catches on and will likely close down some of the lawlessness that seems to go on in that sector of society.

I took special notice and gave special attention when Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor identified herself as somewhat of a dispute resolution officer. The Supreme Court packs more punch in a day's work than almost any of us realize, dealing with foreign intelligence matters daily. To the best of my knowledge the Senate and House intelligence committees are fully informed of their activities. Another sector in that community includes private attorneys. In this case they were granted permission to sue for psychological damage on my behalf. Case file number CV6278-91 at distance. Furthermore a number of unique things occurred. One of these included a thunderous voice from heaven, which was the climax to a discussion between myself and many others; lasting for several weeks on this unique channel. I can interpret what it meant. I believe our culture should

know about it and the fact that it did occur. I believe that its occurance should come from a credible source.

Signed,
Dean Ledvina
2900 N. Dixieland, Apt. E8
Rogers, AR 72756
(501) 986-9910

P.S. What weight does a demand and/or request carry?

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-3009

In re: Dean Ledvina,

Petitioner.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas.
[Unpublished]

Submitted: March 30, 2000
Filed: April 6, 2000

Before McMILLIAN, HANSEN, and MORRIS SHEPPARD ARNOLD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Dean Ledvina appeals from the district court's[1] denial of his "Motion to Subpoena Records and Information" from Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, and the court's denial of his motion to reconsider. Having carefully considered the matter, we conclude that denial of the subpoena was correct, *see In re United States*, 197 F.3d 310, 313-16 (8th Cir. 1999) (subpoena should not issue against high government official absent extraordinary circumstances, including showing that official possesses information essential to case which is not obtainable from another source, and showing of entitlement to relief sought), and that denial of reconsideration was not an abuse of discretion, *see Sanders v. Clemco Indus.*, 862 F.2d 161, 169-70 (8th Cir. 1988) (standard of

---

[1] The Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas.

review; movant's failure to present arguments not previously considered by district court is controlling factor against granting reconsideration).

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
FAYETTEVILLE DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF
DEAN LEDVINA PRO SE
EX PARTE PLAINTIFF

CASE NO. 99-FA-14

ORDER

NOW on this 24 day of June, 1999, comes on for consideration a motion to reconsider motion to subpoena records from Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor (document #6) filed by Dean Ledvina Pro se June 10, 1999, and the Court, being well and sufficiently advised, finds that the motion should be, and it hereby is, denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

JIMM LARRY HENDREN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DISTRICT COURT I
WESTERN DISTRICT DIST.
ARKANSAS
FILED

JUNE 24 1999

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
FAYETTEVILLE DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF
DEAN LEDVINA PRO SE
EX PARTE PLAINTIFF

CASE NO. 99-FA-14

ORDER

NOW on this 8 day of June, 1999, comes on for consideration a request by Dean Ledvina Pro se to keep this matter under seal (document #1) filed on May 26, 1999, and the Court, being well and sufficiently advised, finds that the request should be, and it hereby is, granted and this matter placed under seal.

Also before the Court is Pro se's motion to subpoena records and information from Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor (document #2) filed on May 26, 1999, and the Court, being well and sufficiently advised, finds that the motion should be, and it hereby is, denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

JIMM LARRY HENDREN
STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

U.S. District Court
Western Dist. Arkansas
FILED

JUNE 8 1999
CHRIS R. JOHNSON, CLERK
Deputy Clerk